G. R. S. 59]

GPB—15,000—20 12 13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1906
(Munzai)

File No. 14

Serial Nos. 1618

Papers Filed.

Month November 1910.

SUBJECT.

Management of Inam lands endowed to Viswesvara Swami Temple at Godavi Ghatt & Sri Rangapatanam Taluk.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.

Survey no.	Extent	Assessment. Rs as P.
417	2 — 5	16 — —
418	1 — 15	10 — —
421	2 — 15	18 — —
*429	2 — 13	19 — —
430	1 — 31	14 — —
431	1 — 37	16 — —
432	2 — 31	22 — —
433	1 — 24	12 — —
434	2 — 13	18 — —
435	1 — 31	14 — —

*Survey no.	Extent	Assessment
436	1 — 17	11 — —
437	2 — 20	19 — —
425	— — 22	4 — —
Total	24 — 34	193 — —

Note

Mysore Dy Commissioner's Letter no 8 dated 12th July 1871 regarding the recovery of rent due by to the Kasi Visweswary -swamie Temple at Gunjam Seringapatam Taluk.

The temple of Visweswara at Gunjam is a Mujrai Institution endowed with the marginally noted Inam lands in Kirangur Village, Seering -patam Taluk. The affairs of the Institution were being managed in the line of Sarvagna as

the last of whom was Dharmaraja Bharathi. He died in 1895 without appointing a successor to himself.

For some years past the management of the temple had been very unsatisfactory; the temple building had fallen into disrepair, and the proceeds of the Devadaya Inam lands granted for its maintenance were not wholly applied towards the object of the grant but were paid towards the debts contracted by the managers of the Trust. The temple and its lands were reported to be in the possession of one Venkatagiri Gosayi, a creditor of the last manager Dharmaraja Bharathi who

to above, and whom the latter while alive, had appointed as his agent for the management of the temple lands.

In view to prevent further misuse of the temple funds the Dy Commr, in his letter No 1054 dated 5th January 1897 recommended that the Trust and its endowments be taken over under the direct management of the Mysore Department, and that the annual savings out of the proceeds of the temple lands after defraying the expenses of Sanditura, be paid to Venkatarajiah Iyengar

towards the satisfaction of
the debt due to him by the late
Shamaraja Bharati.

4 The Dy Comr's proposal
to take over the temple under
the direct management of
the Mugrai Department was
approved* and the Dy Comr
was accordingly directed
to take charge of the lands
belonging to the Institution
forthwith and place the
same under the management
of the Taluk Amildar. But
the Govt did not accept
the Dy Comr's recommendation
on behalf of Venkatagiree Gosaji
as the person was not entitled
to any portion of the proceeds

of

* Vide Govt Pro no
920-1 dated 8th
February 1897.

Of the Devadaya Inam lands according to the terms of the Grant.

With reference to the above, the Dy Collr x reported that he took over the temple and its endowments under Govt management; that a Muchulika was also executed by Venkatagiri Gosa binding himself to produce the produce of the Inam lands for 1896-97 whenever required and a security was also taken from him; but that the said Venkatagiri Gosaji having failed to Keep to the terms of the Muchulika the

x In his letter no 95 dated 19th January 1900.

of the Swamy, Viz, Jogendra
giri Gosayi, was attached
and sold for only Rs 186,
though its estimated value
aggregated to Rs 700; and
that therefore the said property
might be brought in with
advantage for the institution
for the same upset price;
that as regards the produce
of the years 1897-98 & 1898-99
Venkatagiri Gosayi had leased out
the Inam lands to Battu Gowda
and another for 3 years from
Havilambi to Vikari, but on
receipt of the Govt orders,
the Amildar took a Muchulika
from the same lessees binding
them to deliver the produce
to

him (Amildar); that in
the meanwhile
the creditors of Venkatagiree
Gosayi had the produce of
1897-98 & 98-99 (left with
Bette Gowda) attached;
that through Venkatagiri-
-Gosayi put in a miscellaneous
petition protesting against
the attachment, the Sub-
Judge, under whose order
the produce was attached
rejected the petition on
the ground that he and
his colessee were the tenants
of Venkatagiree Gosayi &
that they must therefore
abide by the terms of their
lease; that the Sub-Ds

in name of the Bette Gowda

Office

Mr Chengiah Chetty took
a lease from the same tenants
with adequate security;
but before the Dy Amildar
took possession of the produce
for 1899–900 the tenants
had received a notice
from the Sub-Judge's Court[1]; and
accordingly the Sub-Judge
could not,
~~Cannot~~ for reasons stated (by the Dy Comr[n])
attach the produce of the same
lands in question, and therefore
therefore the order of attachment
of produce might be set
aside.

In reply, the Dy Comr
was asked to report
[1] the date of the Muthulukka
taken by the Amildar
from the lessees of the

[1] In His Office Akl-No
822 dated 24th January
1900

the Inam lands

ii whether the produce

in respect of which a notice

of attachment was issued

by the Court was due to

Govt under the afore-

-said mutchulika or

what was due to Venkata-

-giri Gosavi prior to the

date of the mutchulika.

and

iii the particulars of
of Gopambagiri Gosavi
the property reported to
^
have been sold for

Rs 186.

7 In reply, the Dy Commr

x
reported that the 1st
u
mutchulika taken by the

Amildar from

x. In his letter no 110 dated

22nd February 1900.

binding them not to pay the
Sutta to Venkatagiri Gossayi,
pending the orders of Govt;
that a second Muchulika
was also executed by them
on the 28th April 1897, to the
same effect; that two
similar
more Muchulikas were
^
subsequently given by the
ryots to the Amildar on
the 5th & 28th June 1899,
respectively; that it was
the produce of the Inam lands
for the years Hevilambi
and Vikari which the Sub-Judge
of Mysore had attached;
particulars of the
and that the property
^
said Whose been sold
for

only Rs 186 ~~were~~ as noted in the margin*.

*

Tiled house of 20 Ankanams — Estimated value } Rs 600

Dry land Survey no 7/1 measuring 4 ac 13 guntas assd. Rs 4-12-0 } 50

Dry land Survey no 7/2 measuring .4 ac 1 gunta assd. Rs 4-4-0 } 50

Total Rs 700.

8 With reference to the above the following Darkast (no 667 dated 21st December 1900) was written from this office:-

"From the records read "with the above, it is "observed that the manage- "-gement of the temple and "its Inam lands was assumed "by the Taluk Amildar in "April 1897; and on the "28th idem, a muchulika "was executed by Batte Gowda "and Hanume Gowda, "the two pujaris who were "then cultivating the temple "lands, binding themselves "to pay to the Amildar one

" Of the temple are annual Gutta
" of 130 Kundies of Paddy, 130
" Seers of other grains and
" 130 bundles of hay, with
" effect from the year Hevilambi
" (1897-8); but the Gut- the
" Arichaar took no steps
" to keep the Gutta from the
" royals.
" 2. Subsequently, however,
" on the 5th June 1899, the same
" royals Batta Gowda and
" Hamme Gowda, have deposed
" before the Dy Arichaar of
" French Rocks, that they
" sold away the 260 Kundies
" of paddy due by them to the
" temple for the years Hevilambi
" and Vilambi 1897-8 and
q at Rs 5 per Kundy
by course

" because of their inability
" to pursue the handy, and
" that they would pay the
" sale-proceeds aggregating
" to Rs 1300 within a month's
" time, and that in default,
" their property might be
" proceeded against. And
" again on the 28th June 1899
" another mutchulika
" has been executed by the
" same ryots agreeing to
" pay to the temple a gutta
" of 130 Kandies of handy
" for the year Vikari 1899-900.
" But the records do not
" show that any steps have
" yet been taken by the
" Commr to

"Kuttu due to the temple for
"the 3 years Hemalambi,
" Vilambi and Vikari,
" under the aforesaid two
" muchelikas executed
" by the royals in June 1899.
" This is much to be regretted,
" and the Dy Amildar's
" explanation in the matter
" should be obtained
" and submitted.
" 2. The Dy Comr is now
" requested to direct the
" Amildar of Gunch-Rocks,
" within whose jurisdiction
" the temple lands are, it
" is presumed, situated,
" to recover all arrears from
" the royals the Kuttu due
the years Hemalambi,

" Vilambi and Vikari in
" accordance with the
" aforesaid amendments.
" The Sutra due for the
" current year Sarvari
" should also be recovered
" forthwith, before the paddy
" is otherwise appropriated
" by the ryots.
" 3. The Sutra amount-
" realized for these 4
" years may be invested in
" the Land-Savings Bank
" at the credit of the temple
" 4. The undersigned is
" also to request that the
" result of the actions taken
" in pursuance of the fore-
" going orders may be

" reported to this Office
" within a fortnight from
" this date. On receipt
" of the report, further
orders will be passed
on the other points raised
in the letter under reply."

With reference to the
above, the Dy Commr reported
in his letter no 8 dated
12th July 1901, that as the
execution proceedings of the
Civil Court were not binding
on Government, and as the
cultivators of the Inam lands
had prior to attachment by
the Civil Court ~~attached~~ bound
themselves to the Dy Assistant
by executing muchalikas

binding themselves to pay the
rents to Government, he had
issued orders for the recovery
of the arrears of rents from
Haridaswali up to date.

10 In a subsequent letter
the Dy Commr requested
for the return of the Vsr
records for some reforms,
which were accordingly
returned, and they have
not yet been received
back.

11 Venkatagiri Zamindar
has now filed a suit
against Chinna Pattegondu
-ssu of Pattegondu for
the recovery of

within
of Jurisdiction due to our two
Inam lands attached to
the temple.

Chockalingatta gowda filed
a written statement praying
that the temple in question
having been already taken over
under Government management,
the Dy Commr of the Mysore
District should also be
a party to the suit. The
Sub-Judge accordingly
passed an order on the
7th January 1902, and
adjourned the case for the
20th March 1902.

The Dy Commissioner
in forwarding copies of
the plaint, the written statement
and

and the Subjudge's order

solicit (in his letter no

211 dated 8th January 1902)

permission

to defend the suit at the

expense of Government. He

has also submitted a

copy of draft written

statement proposed to be

filed in answer to the said

suit.

The points now for the

Board's consideration are:—

on the following points viz

further

What action was

taken to recover the produce

for 1896-97 from Venkata-

-giri Lyengar (Vide para 5)

and why was not this

question raised in

By Amildar, when he

obtained one telulikas

from Patil Gowda and

Hanmegowda for the delivery of the

produce with effect from

Hevilambi (1897-98).

ii In the one telulikas executed

by the two ryots named

above, they bound themselves

to pay to the Amildar on

behalf of the temple towards

one annual kutta of 130

Kandikes of paddy, 130

seers of other grains and

130 kandikes of hay with

effect from the year Hevilambi

(1897-98) - vide para 8.

Patil then subsequently

deposed before the Amildar

X. dated 5th June 1899

Annakutty Kunhikkaya sold
annually 260 Kandies of
paddy due by them for
the years Kunjikunhi and
Velumbi (1897-98 & 98-99)
at Rs 5 per Kandy and
Kunhikkaya would pay the
sale-proceeds aggregating
to Rs 1300 within a month's
time. Why did the tenants
sell the paddy at such a
low price as Rs 5 per Kandy?
Why was not the amount
(Viz Rs 1300 accordingly to
their own statement)
remitted from them
immediately after the
last crop of one year

time they are required? What-

about 130 Kansas seeds

of other species and 130

bundles of hay, which

they were learned to give

annually?

iii What steps were taken

to recover the Gutta due

for the years Vikari and

Sarvari as directed

in para 2 of the Magistrate

Levy's Board's letter in

para 8? What about the Gutta for Plaza?

ii What has been done towards the repairs of the temple?

These points have not been

even now

clearly explained in the

Dy Commr's letter noted

in para 9.

In order to defer

* The hearing of which comes off on the 20th March 1902

* the suit as now reported in the Dy Comm's letter no 211 dated 3rd January 1902 he has not pointed out the source, from which the cost was proposed to be met. He has therefore been addressed on the point (vide his Office Docket no 1314 dated 24th Feb

Subd to the Dewan

15 The written statement may be approved, and the D Comm asked to engage a competent Advocate to appear and plead on behalf of Govt.

It is to be regretted that although the temple and its lands were taken over by Govt so far back as four years ago, not even

a single years rent has been collected by the Rev Authorities. Steps may be ordered to be taken to collect the arrears at once, and out of such collections the costs of the present suit may be met.

11/3/02

now until Tuesday when it is necessary and into Court & what necessary & deal with it in due course

11 III 02

Sept 11/3/02

The negligent Officials of whom there were more than one should be made personally liable in the same manner in which they are threatened in this matter. They have neither recovered the possession of the land nor collected the produce with value for the years - If the Dy Comr gave the assurance to Bellegooda that he will be supported & the powder does not seem to have given over any advantage to him or rather the Dy Comr for which he can claim to be remunerated in the shape of this promised support. He did away the produce and has not paid a single fee - Men seem to be under the impression that they should volunteer to defend the suit. The first Govt's order to make the Dy Comr party seems to have been based upon an expressed intention of the Dy Comr to deal with. On the whole I am not - from the facts laid before me - prepared - to authorize the defence of this suit at Govt cost The head Officers will be held responsible for all the money due on this account which they must collect from the lessees whose lease they accepted - They must

Note Continued :-

1/x The Damans orders were communicated to the Deputy Commissioner in Govt Gen no 1426-34 Mog Fr 33-96 dated 14th March 1902, a printed copy of which is hereto appended.

In reply, the Dy Commissioner has, with his letter no 360 dated 14th June 1902, submitted an explanatory memo from one C. B. Lokhande Rao, Asst Commr, and begs for reconsideration of the Govt decision communicated in the Gen cited above in the matter of depending

the suit at the cost of

the temple funds

Submitted

18/6/02

Subd to the Dewan.

Mr. Seshagiri Rao's memo does not appear to me to be very convincing to reconsider the order already passed. While above a day passed, Mr. Ayyangar calling on the Secretary Mr. Seshagiri Rao and Mr. Krishnaswamy said that Mr. Bellingham had paid up the rent deficit from Krishnagoud and was receiving it but Krishnagoud had absconded without the question of the suit being disposed by Govt. in any way. I think the Dy. Commr. may be informed that Govt. see no necessity to reconsider the order already passed

Yes. The tribal dispute
appeal should be
made over to Mr. Wadia
as soon as
possible
are and Mr. Wadia
passed under

8.9.02

Issue orders as regards
Mr. Wadia. Ask
Mr. Wadia how the matter
stands now
30/9/02

Morgan Manager
Speak to me
about this
10/9/02

RD
28/6/02
4961

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No of 190

e Vote continued

32) As directed by the Dewan, the Deputy Commissioner was informed that the Govt did not see sufficient grounds to re-consider their Order already passed in Pro no 426-34 Mwxt 33 96, dated 14th March 1902, declining to authorize him to defend at Govt cost the suit preferred by Venkatagiri Gosayi against Bette Gowda, one of the tenants of the Inam lands of the Sri Viswesvaraswamy temple at Ganjam in the Srirangapet Taluk The Deputy Commissioner was at the same time requested to intimate (1) what had been done in the matter of buying up the property of Jogendagiri Gosayi, the surety of Venkatagiri Gosayi, attached and sold for towards the recovery of the produce of the Temple inam lands due from the latter for the year 1896-97, (2) whether the arrears due from Bette Gowda and his co-lessee for the years 1897-98 and 1898-99, ~~and the sum from~~

in this Office no 6992 of 10 02 Slip V.

Slip U.

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Viraraka Gowda for the 2 subsequent years were fully
and (3) whether the arrears for 1899-00 & 1900-01 were also
recovered. But no final replies have been since received.
received on those points.

23) In November 1903, it was brought to * Petn no 580 dy 6 11 03 Slip W.
the notice of Govt that the lands in question
which were situated at Kirangur in the
Srirangapatam Taluk had been allowed
to remain uncultivated. The Deputy Commissioner
was thereupon requested to report if it was true § Mis Office no 15246 dy 30. 11 03. Slip X
and if so, who was personally responsible for
that neglect of duty. From the latter's report ✕ no 154 dy 1 1 04. Slip Y
it is observed that the ryots who were cultivating ✕ one B. K. Venkataramaniya
the said lands having, on account of the
decrees obtained by Venkatagiri Gosayi
suffered great loss offered to take them up
that year also but for a smaller patta of
110 Kandres of paddy, that the Deputy Amildar
thereupon auctioned the right of cultivating the
lands and the highest bid was made by one
Satchê Rao, who offered to pay 112 Kandres of
paddy, on condition that he was allowed to cultivate

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

them for 3 years together, but that on the Deputy Commissioner Mr. M. Kantaraj Urs having ordered the lease to endure for only one year ~~for the trap~~ to avoid loss to the temple, Batche Rao's bid fell through, and that none else came forward to cultivate the lands, as they were afraid of Venkatagiri Gosayi who was now and then harassing them with the attachments of their properties. His report of the Deputy Commissioner was recorded* with the observation that the Deputy Amildar, when he did not get lessees, ~~should have secured~~ ought to have got the lands cultivated in amani, and that he should see to the proper cultivation of the lands from that year forward.

* His Office No 2189 Dy 29.1.04. Slip Z.

24) The Deputy Commissioner (Mr. H.H. Sparks) now writes to say that he has received a notice from the Sub. Judge of Mysore, intimating that the suit and the Execution Proceedings of Venkatagiri Gosayi vs Dhanaraja Bharati have been referred to the Chief Court for orders and that the

§ No 275 Dy 2.3.05. Paper under disposal

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

hearing has been posted to the 11th instant, and he solicits instructions as to what action should be taken by him in the matter now, as ~~the~~ the Govt have already declined to defend the suit at their cost He also states that the Dt and Taluk Officials being new, they are not cognizant of the facts of the case

Submitted for orders

8/3/05

95) This report has been received very late It was received on the 6th instant while the date of hearing in the Chief Court is the 11th instant.

26) The question of defending this suit came twice before the Dewan and on both occasions he declined to sanction the defence of the suit at the cost of Govt. Slip V

27) It is not known on what point the question has come up before the Chief Court. Perhaps the safest plan would be to authorize the Govt Advocate to appear on behalf of Govt on the 11th instant, and do the needful

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No of 190

in the interests of the temple.

Thanta Samastha
8/3/05

Submitted to the Dewan
through the 2nd C.

24) Venkatagiri Gowda is a grant-holder of the village, in which the temple of Sri Kantheshwara stands. He came forward to cultivate the lands which were in possession of the Mutt and the Gowda who would take out encroachments against them. At the end of Kharif it is necessary that he should separate his share and pay for all pattas and to the Government. Advocate may be requested to appear on behalf of Government before the C. Court.

(Mugali Ali)

9/8/05

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

MGCPB—3,500—15 10-04



Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note continued :—

30) As directed by the Dewan, the Govt Advocate who was requested to appear on behalf of Govt before the Chief Court, has forwarded to us a copy of their judgment wherein the judges observe that if the Dy Commr persistently neglects to comply with the order of the Sub Judge in execution, the decree holder may obtain his remedy against recalcitrant execution as he may be advised and on this point they say that they have no opinion to express. They are further of opinion that the reference of the Subordinate judge to the Chief Court "appears to have been made of his own motion and under a misapprehension". Under these circumstances they think that they should make no orders as to costs

the chief judge and the other two judges

Advised

Muzrai Secretariat | File No

of the parties who appeared in
(Chief)
the Court.

31) may a copy of the Chief Court's judgment be sent to the Dy Commissioner, Anjaum District, with reference to his letter no 275 dated 2nd March 1905, referred to in page 15 of this note?

submitted

ds
29/5/05

The copy of the judgment is submitted for perusal

32) A copy may be sent to the Deputy Commissioner of Ganjam for information and for report as to what further action he would propose being taken in the matter.

33) At the same time, the Govt Advocate may be requested to advise Govt as to what should now be done in the interests of the temple

T. Ramakrishna Rao
30/5/05

8/30
By a Runner
12 VIII-05

346
31-5-05.

Submit to the Trustees through the Dy C.

Rec'd 17/8
17/8/05

Yll 1/6/05

MGCPB—1,500—15 10 01
Drafts submd 19.8.05 Yll

69 40/2 6/05

1/6/05

(20)

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note continued :—

35) As directed on page 19 of this note the Govt Advocate was written to to favor Govt with his opinion as to what should now be done in the matter. In reply he states that the Dy Comm^r might be instructed to inform the Sub Judge that the produce now held in deposit cannot as requisitioned by him cannot be given over as the crop did not belong to the Judgment debtor. He says that such a procedure will drive the Court Sale purchaser to a suit for the recovery of the land which could be successfully defended on grounds as under

(1) the resumption of the management of the temple affairs by Govt

(2) the collusive nature of the decree obtained without making the Muz: Dept a party

(3) the invalidity of the sale held. &c &c

Submitted with a draft to Dy Comm^r 30/9/05 by

The draft put up may

MGCPB—3500—15-10-07

Muzrai Secretariat | File No of 190

may if so submitted, be issued.

Submitted to the Dewan through the 2nd/s

T Chandrasekara Rao 9/10/05

Geo. Taylor

Read 9/10/05.

Read 10/10/05

Draft added by the Dewan

Issue Cl 18/11/05

9/11/6 16.10.05

Note continued.

The draft above referred to was issued in this Office vide memo dt 21st Nov. 1905.

37) The Dy Commr submits for ~~favour of~~ orders the petn of Venkatasiva Gozaji who gives the history of the case as already narrated in this Office note and prays that the management of the Mani lands may be entrusted to him on the

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

understanding that he should properly and satisfactorily maintain the charities until the sum of Rs 14620-8-2 is recouped out of the balance of the income from the lands after defraying the cost of the temple management

36) The Dy Comr at the same time points out that the Govt in their Ltr no 920-1 dated 8th July 1897 submitted vide 1806 directed the assumption by the Mugrai Department of the entire management of the temple and its endowments.

37) The orders of Govt conveyed in their Ltrs no 1426-34 dated the 14th March 1899 in reply to 33-96 give a full history of the case -

Submitted with a draft letter for Govt

Muzrai Secretariat | File No | of 190

Muz. 8 A1

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

Note continued

(4 Slip 9) 40) The draft was accordingly issued It was clearly pointed out among other things. That the petitioner Venkatagiri Gosa- was not entitled to any part of the proceeds of the Devadaya Inam lands in liquidation of the debt due to him by the late Manager Dharmaraj Bharati that according to the terms of the grant, the income had to be wholly applied for the bona fide purposes of the temple and that Govt could not accept the Dy Commissioner's - recommendation.

(Ref 12/20 July 1908) Slip K 41) The Dy Commissioner has submitted his report together with the records of enquiry—

(Slip L) 42) The Inam Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore has been called for.

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

of the Inam register pertaining to the Inam lands in question. It is mentioned therein that the lands in question are Devadaya Inams intended for Saditana and Deepa-aradhane services in Sri Kasivisweswara-Swamy and other temples at Gooti Ghat in Ganjam.

43) The Dy. Commissioner reports that he sees no reason to modify the previous order of Govt. (issued upon orders of the late Dewan Sir K. Sheshadri Iyer) declining to grant Venkatagiri Gooti's prayer. A similar prayer was rejected by Govt. in the Endorsement issued so far back as 21st August 1897. The Assistant Comm's English letter gives a clear account of the steps taken since 1896-7 for the recovery of the gutta amounts due

(Stp-K)

(Stp-M)

(Stp-N)

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muzrai Secretariat	File No. of 190

from the lands In regard to the suggestion that the lands may be conveniently leased out for periods of 5 or 10 years. the Assistant Commr gives it as his opinion that it is more advantageous to lease out the lands every year by public auction if there should be proper competition The lands are reported to have been leased out to one Bomme Gowda of Kenaguer for a period of 5 years from 1905-6 at 115 Rupees a year the total savings at the credit of the institution is reported to be Rs 7266 and odd.

* (Illegible) A D C. B Statement has also been received from which it will be observed that the balance outstanding is Rs 3094-11-3.

(* Illegible) C/f Shivashottamma

of Mysore had petitioned Govt praying that a Board of Trustees might be appointed to ensure the regular conduct of services etc in the institution, that the Faditara amounts might be placed in their hands as also the amounts required for repairs to the temples and that he might be appointed as one of the Trustees in consideration of the interest taken by him for the well being of the institution In regard to his prayer, the (illegible) Asstt Commr merely states that there is no necessity to ~~at~~ entrust the management to the petr The Dy Commr reiterates the Asstt Commr's views It is reported that Venkatagiri Gosai has made arrangements for the daily worship and Hatakinkatte

Muz. 8 A 1

Muzrai Secretariat	File No. of 190

Utsavams in the temple.

(Petition Dt 9th August 1908) (Slip H) Mr H Narasinga Rao Counsel for Venkatagiri Ghosar. keeps for a personal hearing in the case

Submitted

2 Hott ff
(46) Gpi this d Inspr
after the Darsan
a date may be fixed
in connection with this
account &
2/12 a. Cent

1 5

4) The enclosed letter from the Counsel for the Venkatagiri Zamindar is submitted. It is argued that as Venkatagiri Zamindar is maintaining the Temple the amount required by him for this temple should be exempted. The Committee agreed that this is fair and that if it is agreed that Venkatagiri Zamindar is liable only [illegible] a separate Statement should be prepared from the Dt Collr.

It was also urged that a Statement be sent for how the Temple Expenses Govt should pay last year and one or more years.

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Serial No.

Venkatagiri Swamy is not the Mokhasadar of the Temple and accompanied. Mr. the Inspector in that account (Ext. in 209) and the D.S. Court does not support this.

Should draft letter.

G.
17.11.09

To,

(1) The Dy. Commissioner, Mysore Dist.
Letter no. 276 dated 16th Nov. 1908.
Calls for further particulars on the claim of Venkatagiri Gosain for the amounts said to be due to him from the Kasi Viswesvaraswamy temple in Gosayi Ghat, Ganjam.

From.

(2) Venkatagiri Gosain and his Agent Nanjunda
Petition no. D. 502.
Encloses a written statement filed before the Additional Munsiff, Mysore, to the effect that a total sum of Rs 22890-8-2 including the interest is due to them a list showing the expenditure incurred in the temple for Nityakatla and Hetchukat services and other documents filed in the Mysore Sub Judge's Court in the year 1892 and states that their Advocate represent the remaining facts in person.

Submitted with a Reminder to Dy. Commr. 25.1.191

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50 000—13-5-08

23/11/09.

25/1/10

Serial No.

50) To, The Dy. Commr, Mysore Dist
Letter no 276 Dy 19.11.08
States that the case relating to the Kasi Viswesvara temple in Gosayi Ghat was heard before Govt on the date of the present communication and calls for further information on the subject.

51) It was stated that when the case was argued before Govt, it was urged for the petr that he had been paying the Govt dues and maintaining the temple also well, and the Dy. Commr was asked to submit if the allegation was true, a detailed Statement showing the amount due to Venkatagi Gosain that officer was also requested to furnish the details of the expenditure shown in the Statement submitted.

52) From, Venkatagiri Gosain and Ranjendra
Petition Dy 31-12-08.
Furnishes the accounts and other papers regarding the amounts due to him

53) To The Dy Commr, Mysore Dist
Docket no 1275 Dy 10 3 09

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Inam File No. 33 14, of ~~190~~ 1906 ~~1895~~

Serial No.

Forwards the petition of Venkatagiri Gosain and requests that the sub of the report may be expedited

From, the Dy Commr, Mysore Dist

Letter no 137 Dy 24/7/09

Submits report together with the entire records

The Dy Commr reports that from 1895-6 to 1900-1, the local cess and other Govt dues were paid by Venkatagiri Gosain and his Agents as particularized by him that from 1901-2 to 1907-8, these were paid by the Govt from the produce of the lands, and that from the time of the resumption of the Inam lands, the cost of maintaining the temple was not borne by Govt. That officer adds that neither Venkatagiri Gosain nor his Agent has produced the list of expenditure incurred towards the maintenance of the temple The details of the expenditure refd to in the Statement, are given in the Amildar's no 13 dated 23rd July 1909

Submitted for orders

AD 29/11/09 T.I 10

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

Under-Secretary's note:—

56) The previous pages of this Note give a full history of this case, but, as it appears, ~~the connection between the several communications in this case does not appear to have been made~~ disjointed quite clear. I propose to briefly recapitulate the facts chronologically before dealing with the question to be now decided

57) One Udaya Bharati, a Gosayi, constructed a Siva temple in the Gosayi Ghat at Srirangapatam in which the five idols constituting the Siva Panchayat were consecrated. At the recommendation of Sowcar Nowl Krishna Doss the late Maharaja in 1821 endowed the institution with land Inams of 100 pagodas (Vide Inam extract).

58) In 1878 Lakshmana Bharati, the great-grand disciple of Udaya Bharati was managing the temple and endowments. He contracted loans from Jagannatha Achary and Appraneya Iyengar in may and october 1878 and appointed the former as his Agent to manage the institution. As the Inam Settlement was then proceeding and as the alienation rules had been published a few

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

months before this I am of opinion that the Agency was a mere cloak for the creditor to reimburse himself from the income of the endowed lands 59) Venkatagiri Gosayi seems to have been one of the disciples of this Lakshmana Bharati; and does not appear to have liked the idea of making over the management to others Anyhow there arose misunderstanding as refs to in the Register of Inam Enquiry. It is said that the Inam Assistant the late Mr Syed Nasimuddin advised the parties to effect an amicable Setelement In 1880 Venkatagiri Gosayi Lakshmana Bharati's disciple lent money To Bhanaraja Bharati and liquidated gaganathachary's and Apparaya-Iyengar's loan and was appointed Agent The Inam was confirmed to the temple

Sub E) 23-7-1880

P.C. S F & F.)

60) A few days prior to the death of Lakshmana Bharati, gaganathachary in oct 1878 secured from him in favour of one of his (gaganathachari's) dependants a lease of the lands for 15 years. When gaganathachari's loan was liquidated the lease also is said to have been orally cancelled and the lease-deed returned

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27.4.09

Serial No.

Soon afterwards litigation about this lease commenced and the Chief Court decision in A.S No. 14 of 1882 went against Venkatagiri Gosayi. He says that nevertheless, he continued in possession as Ramaswamiayya made himself scarce to evade the payment of certain monies. The latter returned about the year 1888 and again filed Suit no 4 of 1888 in the Dist Court of Mysore for the lands. This ended unfavorably to him, but he was successful in appeal. The chief court in March 1889 decided that Venkatagiri Gosayi should make over possession of the lands, pay the value of the produce Viz Rs 2308-13-6 and also the cost of the suit. Venkatagiri Gosayi says he has satisfied this Decree. which was passed in February 1889

(Slip H)

(Slip 9)

(Slip 10) (A.S 286 of 1888)

(8) Then Venkatagiri Gosayi in August 1889 Complained to the Executive Govt about this alienation of Devadaya lands. The Council Committee in November 1891 after detailing the facts decided unfavorably to Venkatagiri Gosayi remarking as follows :—

(8) All these claims are

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

"of a civil nature The 1st Appellant
"(Venkatagiri Gosayi) states that the
"2d Respt (Dhanaraj Bharati) is collu-
"ding with the 1st (Ramaswamiengar),
"and that the produce of the Inam
"lands is being misappropriated between
"them & so, the 1st Applt or any one
"interested in the Pagoda has right
"to bring a Suit for the dismissal of
"the 2d Respt as the trustee of the
"Pagoda. Govt can assert their
"right to resume the Inams only
"when the Pagoda ceases to exist,
"or is not well maintained, or the lands
"are alienated from the object of
"the grant. An ordinary lease is
"not an alienation, such as would
"justify the resumption of the Inam
"and it is admitted that the Pagoda
"continues to be well maintained"
" Under these circumstances the petrs
will be informed that they may,
if so advised, seek redress in
Civil Courts and that the Govt
cannot interfere in their favour"
(This is File no of 1889-90)
(Sd.) Venkatagiri

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

to the Civil Court filing Suit no 15 of 1892 before the Sub judge on the bond executed by Dharaja Bharati and Suit no 61 of 1892 for other moneys due by the said person. In the 1st Suit he obtained after contention, a Decree against Dharmaraja Bharati only The 2d was apparently for monies spent by Venkatagiri Gosayi for the Management of the temple as Dharmaraja Bharati's Agent. In this case, an ex-parte decree was obtained

(64) It should be remembered that Ramaswamiengar was in possession of the lands as lessee in accordance with the Chief Court's decision of 1888 Venkatagiri Gosayi says that he attempted to attach the produce due by Ramaswamy Iyengar To his Judgment debtor Dharmaraj Bharati but did not succeed. Ramaswamiengar's lease ended in 1894 and he quietly withdrew — Venkatagiri Gosayi got possession.

(65) The temple and its endowment were in the meantime a matter of correspondence in the Revenue Dept

× Slip a)

NOTE—Contn sheet

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

off and on from 1878, and in 1897, a recommendation was made to Govt to the effect that "the lands assigned for the purpose of maintaining the Temple may be taken over by Govt and the management entrusted to a respectable set of Panchayetdars under the supervision of the Mugnar Deputy the savings after defraying the cost of worship etc in the temple being paid to Venkatagiri Gosay, who holds civil Court Decrees for Rs 4349-4-9 against Dhanaraja Bharath, the last heir of the founder of the temple who has died without nominating a successor". Assistant Commr Mr Narsingar's memo then submitted gives a succinct account of the case - (Mr Madiah's memo of 1891 may also be perused with advantage) Govt directed that the management should be assumed by the Mug Deputy and that the creditor was not entitled to any part of the proceeds of the Devadaya lands. Venkatagiri Gosayi's petition for review of this order was rejected.

(x Slip IV)
(x Slip O)
(x Slip O,)
(x Slip V)
(x Slip X1)

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

(This is file no. 33 of 1897-7 and is referred to in paras 3 & 4 of this Note)

66) The management was assumed by obtaining 4 Mutchalikas on 28.4.1897 from Venkatgiri the Cultivators of the lands. A Mutchalika has been taken from Venkatagiri Gosayi to the effect that he would give the produce of 1896-7 to Govt one Gogendragiri stood surety for this. The produce was not delivered and steps were taken to recover the value thereof by the sale of the Surety's property.

67) In the meantime one Govinda Ramanna obtained a decree against Venkatagiri Gosayi and in execution attached the decrees the latter had obtained against Dharmaraja Bharati. He also attached the produce due to Venkatagiri Gosayi by the cultivators of the lands Bette Gowda and another in accordance with lease deeds executed by them on 4/2/1896 to Venkatagiri Gosayi prior to the date of the assumption of management by Govt. Bette Gowda who had executed a Mutchalika to make over the produce to Govt put in a Miscellaneous petition which was rightly rejected by the Court on the ground that he was bound

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

by the prior lease deed executed in favour of Venkatagiri Gosayi.
(This formed the subject matter of file noa no of 1900 and is referred to in paras 5 to 10 of this note)
(6) The produce though attached was not produced before Court and so the right to recover the same was sold in auction and purchased by Venkatagiri Gosayi himself. He filed a regular suit against Belle Gowda for the produce. It was proposed to defend this ~~suit~~ at Govt cost as the Dy Commr was to be made a party and as he in his docket no. 7 dated 12th July 1901 to the Sub Divl Officer had said that the Dy Amildar might be authorized to assure the cultivators that in case the Court purchaser brought a suit against them, the Govt would intercede and indemnify them against any loss that they might sustain thereby. As however the lessee Belle Gowda did not give to Govt the produce as agreed the proposal to defend this suit at Govt cost was dropped.

(Slip P.)

Note.—Contn sheet.

GPB—55,0 1—27-4-0 c

Serial No.

This suit is said to have ended in a decree in favour of Venkatagiri Gosayi which, he says, is still unsatisfied as Bette Gowda's properties are heavily encumbered.

(This is file name of 1902 and is refs. to in Paras 11 To 18 of this note)

69) Venkatagiri Gosayi was also at intervals trying to execute the decrees obtained by him against Bhairaraja Bharati in Suits 15 and 61 of 1892 and getting the produce of the lands which had subsequently been leased to other ryots, attached. As remarked by Rao Bahadur Mr. Madiah at page 16 of this note, Venkatagiri Gosayi was a great bug-bear and so nobody would take up the land in 1903.

(This formed the subject of file no. of 1903 and is refs. to in Para 23 to 28 of this note)

The Dy. Commr was being requested by the Sub judge to sur the produce the Dy. Commr was not complying. Mr Paramasiva Iyer in 1905 made a reference to the

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

to the Chief Court who said that if the Dy. Commr persistently neglected to comply with the order of the Subordinate Judge in execution, the decree-holder had his remedy and might obtain the same against resistance to execution as he might be advised and that on that point, the Court had no opinion to express

(This formed the subject of file nos of 1903 refd. To at ~~pages~~ paras 30, of this note)

7(j) Venkatagiri Gosayi finding a resort to the Civil Courts of no avail has reverted to the Revenue Deptt praying that the management of the Temple and its lands may be made over to him so that he may maintain the Temple well and also gradually re-imburse himself the amount due. This petn which was presented to the Dy Commr and forwarded for orders to Govt has now to be disposed of.

7(k) Venkatagiri Gosayi now claims Rs 22,890-8-2 made up as shown below.

1) Rs 4325 due under the decree in Suit

S. 12]
ɔral and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.		
		No. 15 of 1892.
	Rs 489/-	Costs of the Suit
	Rs 114/-	Execution Costs
	Rs 3341-14-0	interest on Decreed amounts
	(Total) Rs 8269-14-0	
	Deduct Rs 787-2-7	realized from the produce of the Inam lands
	Balance Rs 7482-11-5	
2)	Rs 4349-4-9	amount decreed in Suit No. 61 of 1892.
	Rs 356-0-0	Court-costs
	Rs 110-12-0	Execution Costs
	Rs 3274-4-0	Int. on Decreed amounts
	Rs 8090-4-9	Total.
	Deduct Rs 952-8-0	realized from the produce of the Inam lands
	Balance Rs 7137-12-9	
3)	Rs 5000-0-0	amount paid To Ramaswamiengar under Chief Court's Decree
4)	Rs 3120-0-0	cost of maintaining the temple for 12 years from 1897 at Rs 260/- a year
5)	Rs 150-0-0	Govt. dues paid for 5 years. from 1896-7 to 1900-1.

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

Grand Total:— Rs 22,890-8-2

13/ Venkatagiri Gosayi urges that the loan contracted by Dhanaraj Bharati was for the benefit of the temple and that therefore he is entitled to get this from the income of the endowed lands I cannot say that this contention has been made out. The bonds evidencing the loan do not say that it was for purposes of the temple, and the decree in O S no 61 for money said to have been spent on the temple is only ex-parte. Ⓧ Venkatagiri Gosayi's contention cannot therefore be admitted. Govt have at the very commencement decided that the creditor is not entitled to any part of the proceeds of the Devadaya lands. Items 1, 2, and 3 should, I think, be disallowed.

F

B, C & E

Ⓧ. Even if it is said that the loan to be for the purposes of the Temple Venkatagiri Gosayi can have no claim on the money except ~~barbarded~~ saved by the Govt out of the revenues of the Temple.

14) The same cannot be said of items 4 and 5 As the temple was being maintained by Venkatagiri Gosayi and as he has paid the Govt dues for some years while the produce was being taken by Govt the former is entitled to get the cost of maintenance and the cesses

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

paid by him to Govt. If any pre-
cedent were wanted for giving this
equitable relief, there is the order
of Govt in a similar case of the owners
no. 28 of 1898) Srirangapatam Taluk.
Slip K

7) The amount thus due has next
to be ~~paid~~ fixed. Venkatagiri Gosayi
says he has paid Rs 150/ for cesses.
In his letter No 137/D 21. 9 1909
The Dy. Commr says Rs 160-12-11 have
been paid. We may thus pay what
the party claims.

7a) For maintenance Venkatagiri Gosai
claims Rs 260/ a year in his affidavit
inclusive of Rs Nityakattle and Kelelu-
kattle charges though in an enclosure
thereto he has given details for
Rs 291-10-8. A reference to para 17 of
Slip C) Memo of Rev 1896 shows that the annual expenditure
of the temple was Rs 200/ more or
less and that Venkatagiri Gosayi
Slip S wanted a scale of expenditure not
exceeding Rs 250/. In these circumstances
it seems to me that we cannot pay
more than Rs 200/ a year. Thus we
may on the whole pay Rs 250/

7b) The next question is whether
we may pay this at once The Dy. Comm

Note—Contn sheet.

Serial No.

in this office no. 276 dated 19th novr 1908 was requested to forward a detailed statement showing the amount due to Venkatagiri Gosayi and to report if the allegation that he had paid Govt dues and was maintaining the temple well was true Venkatagiri Gosayi's affidavit with its enclosures was also forwarded to the Dy. Commr. The Dy. Commr in his letter no 137 Dy 24th September 1909 says that Venkatagiri Gosayi has produced no accounts to show what he has spent on maintenance - the absence of accounts has been accounted for in the affidavit. No attempt seems to have been made to ascertain by local enquiry if the claim is fair.

(4) We have next to see if any amounts are due to Govt by Venkatagiri Gosayi. It may be said that he is bound to give the produce of 1896-7 according to his Muttchalika; but as we assumed management towards the close of the year and as 25% have been realized and ~~as~~ we are not paying the maintenance charges of 1896-7, it seems to me that we may stop

NOTE.—Contn sheet

G. R.

Secretarial
avenue

File No

[2]
d Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Serial No.

the claim for the balance.

79) It is also necessary to see if Venkadagiri Gosaji is to be held responsible for any other money, and in so doing we may also see whether all the money due to Govt has been recovered. If, as stated in the previous Para, we leave out the year 1896-7, there will remain only 12 years including 1908-9 to be considered. The Dy. Commr has furnished accounts for 11 years up to and inclusive of 1907-8, from which it will be seen that the quitta for 1899-1900 and 1901-2 and subsequent years has been fully recovered and credited to the Treasury. The quitta for 1897-8, 1898-9 and 1900-1 was due by Bette Gowda and Hanume Gowda at Rs 538-7-8 and 420-3-2 for each year or Rs 1615-7-0 from Bette Gowda and Rs 1260-9-6 from Hanume Gowda for the 3 years. Out of this, a sum of Rs 322-8-0 + 107-8-0 + 58-5-6 + 34-15-9 + 63-00 + 18-4-0 + 54-12-0 or in all Rs 659-5-3 only has been recovered (and even out of this amount a sum of Rs 73/ shown in the Extra Column

Note—Contn sheet.

GPB—55,0 1)—27 4-09

appears to have been refunded to Linge Gowda as reported by the Amildar in his no. 13 of 23rd July 1909) the balance viz Rs 2216-11-3 (Rs 1260-9-6 + 1615-7-0 — 659-5-3), it is said, has been recovered by Venkatagiri Gosayi (vide Amildar's Report no 900 dated 12th June 1908). — Venkatagiri Gosayi has admitted in para 8 of his Plaint against Bette Gowda in O.S. no 17 of 1901-2 before the Sub-Judge of Mysore that he has received the gutta due by Hanume Gowda. He however, as stated in Para 68 Supra, says that the Decree against Bette Gowda has not been satisfied, but the Amildar's report refs. to above is unfavorable to him thus Venkatagiri Gosayi is only entitled to Rs 255/- 2216-11-3 or Rs 333-4-9. We may pay Rs 166-11-3 for maintenance charges up to the end of the current month during the current year inclusive of Compensation for Liq. prices, also and thus give him a round sum of Rs 500/.

(c) The details of the Expenditure shown in Slip 2 have also been recei

S. 12]
and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

Rs 24-8-0 have been spent on account of litigation, Rs 73/ have been refunded as stated in the previous para and the balance is the Kandayam of the years during which Venkadagiri Gosaji has not paid.

(11) Before concluding, I would invite attention to a few salient points of this case. It will be seen that though the lands were taken possession of in 1897 no steps were taken for maintaining the temple. The same was done in the case of the Kalahasti Nanjundeswara Swamy temple case also (File no. 28 of 1898 put up herewith) though Govt had even sanctioned a scale of expenditure this is a matter deserving to be noticed with displeasure

(12) The next point is about the lease of the lands. The Revenue Dept generally with intent not to cause hardship obtain Rudchalikas from the former lessees who however are bound by their original leases and cannot question the title of their landlords Consequently there will be a conflict between

NOTE.—Contn sheet.

GPB—85,000—27-4-08

(48 49

Serial No.

The Revenue authorities and the Civil Court with the result that as in this case, the lessee will appropriate the money without giving to either party.

(3) I may also in passing point out that to recover money due under leases the Revenue officers do not resort to Civil Courts, but themselves adopt coercive measures.

327

Submitted to Dewan & Hon'ble II & Councillor

Under-Secretary.

24.1.1910.

2620
24/1/10

(4) Prof. Nanjundayya says he has a general power of attorney from Venkatagiri Gosayi & is heard.

Is the Power of attorney in the file?

Ramas & Jagannatha filed a suit in Sub-J's Court.

Council Committee Case.

Two suits - & decrees - one for a bond debt and another for expenses incurred.

(15 & 16).

NOTE.—Contn. shee

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

R. S. 12]
eneral and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 14 of 1906

Serial No.

Venkatagiri pot produce of 1894 1895 & 1896 & took in charge of decrees. Posn deferred in 1884.

The Govt have taken posn of lands since 1897 (Feb) & have taken the produce &c.

The Temple is in posn of V. Gosayi & they have paid Kandaya & Carried on the temple work.

A stt of claim is given — Coming to 22000 Rs.

What about Prasanna Venkatesvara's temple? What concessions given?

26/1/10 (Venkatagiri a partner with pet[r])

OTL—Contn. sheet.

MPG—55,000—27-4-09

. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 14 of 1906

Serial No.

(5) There are only two queries to be answered. The enclosures are returned. There is the power of attorney executed in favour of Mr. James Verkhoyen George is alone now left in Jaffna. He has forwarded this petition in 1905 to the District Court. As this is old petition appears often praying for the disposal of his money if any money is left for it will be to Verkhoyen George.

(X) Slip I)

The Registrar Navagindawara Temple has been instructed for this temporarily (X) to show that it is similar to this case and that the charges for worship were paid to the priests. He also shows the appointing of Hindu officers in temples as they are due to an urgent for worship through they take possession of the endowments. Shown referred to this in para 81 of this note.

3/1 Resubmitted to Secretariat Commissioner Ambalavanar

1/3/1910

The first three items refer to transactions with which government had nothing to do, and

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

to a period during which no part of the proceeds of the property came into the hands of Govt. The petitioner ~~he~~ can have neither a legal nor a moral claim against Govt for reimbursement.

Items 4 & 5 relate to expenses actually incurred during the period when Govt actually got the proceeds of the main lands. I think we may allow him the amount paid for the 9 years in question. He had executed a Muchalka for the Paddy rent due for one year. 655 Rs, out of it has not been realised It is but just that Govt should withhold this sum. He was not liable to pay rent for any other years, as Govt tried to recover it from raiyats directly and (only partly) succeeded.

This amount may be

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPS—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

refunded.

The Dy Cr ~~must~~ may be asked to propose arrangements for future conduct of worship &c. If he considers it satisfactory, there is no objection to enlist the help of Venkatagiri Gosaji, taking of course proper precautions to prevent his misusing the income to recoup himself for his real or fancied past losses.

Please draft an order on these lines & submit to the Dewan for approval

8/3/10

327

Draft submitted to Dewan Concurs in the first instance — for approval of paras 8 and 10. The amount to be paid to annual maintenance has to be specified.

10/3/1910

GPB—55,000—27-4-08

S. 12]
ral and Revenue Secretariat:

File No. 14 of 1906/096

Serial No.

The draft order may be approved.

11/3/10

Draft submitted to Dewan

5092/18.3.10

14/3/1911

Vide dft appd by the Dewan

Issue thereinbefore

Secretariat 15 3 11 1910

To D. C. Mysore and Comptroller

No. 1196-7 Dated 10th November 1910.

Sanctions the payment of a sum of Rs 1295/- to the Petitioner Venkatagiri Gosayi out of the sum at the credit of the distribution and requests the Dy Comr to submit a bill for the amount and directs that the management of the temple be assumed at once and a suitable scale of expenditure submitted for the sanction of Government.

Issue to Dy Comr, Mysore Sandy, 15

NOTE—Contn sheet

GPB—55,000—27 4 09

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Serial No.

Venkatagiri's kuchalka.

d. 19.1.97 -

~~9th~~ agrees to pay 910 Rs price of paddy - rent due that year.

255 Rs realised.

910 Rs - 255 = 655 Rs due -

1906 07 Sl/

From

M. Ka Lavaj Ar. ió y R.A.
Deputy Commissioner
Dt [illegible] Ca

To

L. Ara Tasaccar Fo Cog bA
Secy to the Govt of Mysore
Revenue Department

Dated 5 Sept 1906

Despatched

Received

General No. 90
No.

Enclosure No

Sale rolls for fu
of Ar 1906 fasli 1906
90.5 Ar 1906.

Rejected

Sl
10/9/06

Ste
12/9/06

Note considered
by me
Sl
25/9/06

No 90
Encl

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Dated, Mysore, 5th September 1906

To.

Lt. Arunachalam Naidu Esqr. B.A
Secretary to Government.
Mysore Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to submit herewith for favour of orders petition registered No: 57 dated 31st July 1906 received from Venkatagiri Gosai residing in Bharatipura, Krishna-rajapet Taluq praying that he may be entrusted with the management of the Inam lands endowed to the temple in Gosai Shed, Srirangapatam Taluq on the District understanding that the temple and worship should be properly and satisfactorily maintained and conducted by him until the sum of Rs: 14,620-8-2 is recouped out of the proceeds

of the lands after defraying the cost of the temple management and to state that Government in their Proceedings No. 920—1 dated 8 August 30 91 February 1897 have directed the assumption by Government in the Muzrai Department of the entire management of the Temple of Sri Kasi Viswesa swamy and of its endowments in the Seringapatam Taluq.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient
servant

20-10-06

SE 3

These 3 documents

were presented by

Mr Narasinga Rao

Advocate

23-11-06

Here
Get a copy of the
Urdu Extract from
the Judgment of Munsif
relating to the Court
the claim

29.4.08.

by

S.A.
Advocate

Sl 4

To

The Dy Commr
Mysore District

10.805/(0.)07
Fl 1 & 3

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter no 90 dated the 8th September 1906, forwarding for orders the petition of Venkatagiri Gowda, praying for the restoration of the management of the Inam lands endowed to the Sri Kasi Visweswara Swami temple at Gunjam in the

Tiruvengadapuram Taluk.

The petitioner claims to him the restoration of the management of the Swami lands endowed to the temple, until the sum of Rs 1,620-8-2 due to him by the former manager of the temple under the Civil Court decrees obtained against him, is reimbursed to him out of the residue of the income of the lands, after defraying the cost of the temple management. On this point I am to invite your attention to the Govt. Order No 920-1 dated Fasly 1333-96 the 8th February 1897, in which

was clearly observed
that the petitioner
Venkatagiri Gurungi
was not entitled to any
part of the proceeds
of the Devadayam Inam
lands, which according
to the terms of the grant
must be wholly applied
for the temple purposes
of the temple, and that
the Government could
not accept the Dy Comrs
recommendation to
allow the annual savings
out of the temple lands
to be paid to the petitioner
towards the satisfaction
of the debt due to him
by the late manager
of

of the temple, Dharmaraja
Bhavati. The fact that
the plaintiff Venkatagiri
Ayyangi had no right
to a decree against the
Inamlands of the temple
and that all that he
was entitled to was a
decree against the
defendant Dharmaraja
Bhavati, is supported
by the views taken by the
Sub-Judges of
Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar and
Copies of
G. Saravanasiva Ayyar, whose
judgments the petitioner
has produced with his Advocate's
memorandum of Mr. Narasimha Rao.

12. In these circumstances
I am ~~directed to suggest~~ to request the favour of
your opinion on
~~your~~ the petitioner's
request

(1) Annual No 667 dated 21st December 1900.

(2) Govt. Do No 1426-34 dated 14th March 1902

(3) Govt. Do No 6999 dated 9th October 1902

(4) Do No 2189 dated 24th January 1904.

(5) Board-No 969 dated 22nd August 1905

(6) Do No 2408 dated 21st November 1905.

(7) Do No 4473 dated 5th April 1906.

+

Grants in the petition now under disposal, which is herewith forwarded —

to be entrusted with the management of the Inam lands in question until the recoupment of the sum of Rs 14620-8-2 due to him by Dhanvijaya Bhavati, inam

[illegible]

Commt. to be complied with —

3. In drawing your attention to the communi-cations noted in the margin, the Government very much regret to observe that the local mgt in Offices have not

not shown as ~~fair~~ much
promptness as was expected
of them in the matter of
the management of
the temple lands after
they came into their
possession in 1897.

In those communications
the Dy Comr was requested
(i) to withdraw the action
taken to recover the
produce of the year
1896-97 from Venkata-
-giri Swamy
(ii) to recover from
the cultivating ryots
Rs 1-4-0 and
Rs 1-8-0 the full amount of the
quota due by them to
the temple for the
years ~~1896-97~~, 1897-98
and 1898-99, and 1899-900.

(iii) to submit the explanations of the Officers concerned for the last manner in which they proceeded in this matter

(iv) to report how the question of bringing up the attached property of Jagannathajee (the society for Vaishnavajee Jagannathajee) stood

(v) to report whether the sale of the immovable property of the lessees Babu Jagannath and Hanuman for Rs 430 - one Jagannath in satisfaction of the produce due by them for 1897-98 and

and 1898-99 was confirmed
and whether the full
amount due by them was
recovered
(vii) to report-steps
whether the lease
amount viz Rs 788-2-0
due by the new lessee Sinuke
gowda for 1901-02
was recovered from him
(vi) to report
whether the balance
as by the former lessees
for 1899-900 and 1900-01,
after deducting the
amount recovered
from them, viz Rs 1105-15-3,
was since recovered.
viii) to issue steps
instructions to the Dy
Collector in the matter
of having the lands
situated from 1903-04

being burning ground
cultivated during
the year 1902-03.

and (ix) to take the
needful action on a copy of
the Govt. Advocate's
letter no 68 dated the
26th September 1905,
and report the result
to Government for
information -

~~[illegible]~~

The required informa-
tion on all the above
points should now
be submitted without
further delay -

4 I am also to request
you to kindly submit
a

a statement showing by the lessee amount due by each lessee since 1896-97, the amounts recovered from him and the balance due by him for each year, together with remarks explaining the steps taken for its recovery.

Information is also requested as to whether the lands were given out for cultivation since 1903-04 and if so, to whom and under what conditions, and it should also be reported what amounts were realized and what steps are

now available at the
credit of the institution
and whether they stand
invested in the savings
Bank.

6. The question of
leasing out the lands
on a fair quitta for
a period of 5 or 10
instead of every 3 years
years should also
be considered and
reported upon -

7. Petition no 2006
dated the 20th Oct 1906
received from one
Purushottamananda
- giri Swamiji is herewith
forwarded with a re-
- quest to be informed
existing
of the arrangements

12

in the matter of the
daily worship to be in the
temple.

I have re
30/6/06
Secretary

Ks
18/12/06

Muz. 1 A]

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190 SL 5

From

L ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq, B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Superintendent of
Inam Settlements in Mysore.

Dated

Despatched 7.5.08

Received

General No. 1468/07.
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No

Has the hona to request to be furnished for purposes of reference with ~~a copy~~ an Extract of ~~the~~ the Inam Register, of the grant of lands as inam to the Sri Kasi Visweswaraswami temple at Ganjam, Soraib Taluk.

2 The favour of very ~~an~~ early compliance is requested.

By Order

7/5/08

Secretary.

W 30/5/08

CBP—3 000 copies 21-9-07



Inam Superintendents' Office,
Bangalore, dated 19th/20th May 1908

Sir 6

The Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, Muzrai Department

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 4898 of the 7th Instant requesting to be furnished with an extract from the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of lands as Inam to the Sri Kasi Visweswaraswami temple at Ganjam in the Seringapatam Taluk, I have the honor to request to be informed of the name of the Village in which the said Inam lands are situated so as to enable this office to furnish the extracts required.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

D Nagaraja Rao
Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

Sl. 7

No. 53938/30.5.08

To

The Superintendent

of Inam Settlements

Sir,

With reference to your letter No 138 dy

9th May 1908, I am directed to ~~request~~ state that the marginally noted lands have been endowed as inam to the Sri Kasi Visweswaraswami temple at Ganjam.

The lands are situated in the

of the Srikakulam Taluk

Survey No.	Extent	Assessment
417	2-5	16-0-0
418	1-15	10-0-0
421	2-15	18-0-0
429	2-13	19-0-0
430	1-31	16-0-0
431	1-37	16-0-0
432	2-31	22-0-0
433	1-24	12-0-0
434	2-13	18-0-0
435	1-31	14-0-0
436	1-17	11-0-0
437	2-20	19-0-0
425	0-22	4-0-0

the Copy of the Insurance
Register pertaining
to the grant of the insurance
already called for may
be furnished at a
very early date.

Thanking you

29/5/08
Secy Insurance Dept

29/5/08.

Sl 8

5091
15.6.08
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

Vo. 148

Superintendent's Office,

Dated, Bangalore 16/17th June 1908.

Awaiting report from Dr & Tas... Circuit Tl 23/07.08

From

The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore, Muzrai Department

Sir,

As requested in your letter No. 539 dated 30.5.08, I have the honor to forward herewith, a copy of the Inam Register pertaining to lands endowed as Inam, to the Sri Kasi Visweswaras temple at Ganjam.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

D Ramma Rao

Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

Register Sheet No 48
Taluk - Avitapram
Hobli - Kirangur
Village - Kirang

Copy of the Register of Inams in the village of Kirugavalu in the

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM.

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No. and name of field or fields comprised in the grant. Dry, wet or garden	Extent	
			Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas, and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Measure in acres and their fractions in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
Final quit-rent Register Suppl. S. no: 6			H.J. account 1831	
3	Devadaya	Wet no: 19	K. K. P 11 - " - 7 3/4	
Title-Deed no: 60788 Date of Prepn 1.12.80 Date of issue to Taluk				

Sammat of Kirangoor in the Taluk of Ashtagram

		DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND	
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, etc, whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc., or liable to quit-rent, i. e., jodi, etc, amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the raiyats to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7			
6	7	8	9
P. J. V Rs a p 1000 v = 290-14-7	—	For the temples of Visweswara, Vishnu Durga, Ganapati and Ramanuja Devaru at Ganjam. which as per Amil's Certificate are in good order and Services Continued daily —	Free

DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE INAM

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, etc., and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given
10	11
	1. Necroop dated 9th February 1821 from H. Late Huzoor to the Dowzdar of Ashtapram intimating him that Huzur Sircar Naval Kishna having recommended to grant for the continuance of the Service of Pavithra deeparadhna for Ishwara Vishnu, Durga, Ganapathi and Sri Ranganatha temple built and consecrated by Adaya Bharati Jeeyar by the side of Kaveri at Srirangam You are directed to assign 100 Pagodas worth of land on rent in the Ashtapram Taluk in any place that may be selected by the said Jeeyar for the continuance of the said Devasya Service, original produced.

of Mysore. —

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND		
Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poorniah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
	H. J. a -	
	1803	1831
	viz	Vidya bharati Temples 6 -
		1. Viswesvara
		2. Vishnu
		3. Surya
		4. Sarvapathe
		5. Sri Narayana
		12 00 P. F. V
	Vol	11. 6. 7 3/4 100

of the

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner If the inam has been subdivided, the name, etc., of each sharer should be entered in the columns

Residence, name and age, etc.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Ganjam 1. Viswesa 2. Isuru 3. Durga 4. Gunajata 5. Sri Narayana Devaru Manager, brother			

~~Division~~

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam Assistant's opinion and recommendation	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner
19	20
1. a whole grant. Valid. 2. From the Sanad quoted in col: 11 it will be observed that the grant was made for pasitha and deeparadhane services for the five temples alluded to in the Sanad. and in col. 15 The present Gooé appears to have appointed another Brahmin as his agent to manage the Inam land and to see the services duly carried out; but the Gooé now disputes the agentship and stated more than once that the agent Jagannatha Char does not cause the services to be rendered properly I impressed the Gooé or the manager pro tem	pro tem to get the dispute between himself and the agent settled amicably but he failed to do so though ample opportunities are allowed 3. To be confirmed free Rule 8 (1) (b) Hereditary (Signed) Syed Hussain 3.9.79 Countersigned Subramanya Iyer 9. "S Ray" Superintendent of Inam Estates

1908-09

From
M. Kantaraj Urs Esq., B.A.
Dy Commissioner,
Mysore District.



To
K.S. Chendra Sekhara Aiyar Esq., B.A., B.L.
Secy. to the Govt. of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore, ~~Gen. & Rev.~~ Revenue Depts.

Dated 12 July 08
Despatched 14
Received
General No 24
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file + 2

Subject
Submits report re lands endowed to Sri Kasi Visweswara Swami temple at Ganjam

Refer
A.G.
Please continue note
14/7/08.

No. 24
Enc. No. 1 file + 2

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commissioner

MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore Camp 12/14 July 1908.

To

K.S Chendra Sekhara Iyer
.. . . Esq., B.A. B.L.

SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
~~GENERAL AND REVENUE~~ Judicial DEPARTMENTS.

SIR,

Adverting to your letter No. 80 dated 10th July 1907 and subsequent communications ending with your docket No. 5859 dated 30.6.08 calling for the submission of the report regarding the Ganjam Goosayi Visweswara temple, I have the honor to submit herewith copy of letter No 1088 dated 23rd June 1908 received from the Sub Division officer of French Rocks together with a copy of the statement referred to therein and to state that the information called for has been furnished by the Sub Divisional officer.

2. In the matter of Venkata Giri

giri Goosayi's prayer regard-
-ing the management of the
temple lands being entrust-
-ed to him, I beg to state
that Government have al-
ready observed that the
Deputy Commissioner's re-
commendation to allow the
annual savings out of the
temple lands being paid to
the petitioner in satisfaction
of the debt contracted by the
former manager could not
be accepted and I also hold
the same opinion inasmuch
as the lands were granted
as Devadaya Inam.

3. On receipt of your docket
No. 2408 dated 21st November
1905 and its enclosure, viz
Government Advocate's letter
No. 68 dated 26th September 1905
the Subordinate Judge of
Mysore was written to the
effect that the requisition
of the Court for sending over
the value of the produce
of the Inam lands endowed

to the Sri Kasi Visweswara temple at Ganjam in the Seringapatam Taluk held in deposit to the credit of the temple could not be complied with inasmuchas the crops did not belong to the judgment debtor.

4. It is reported that Venkata Giri Goosayi has made proper arrangements for the daily worship and Utsavas in the temple and that the charge is not by him since the death of Dharmaraja Bharati. The amildar states that there is no necessity to entrust the management to Purushothamananda Giri Goosayi

5. The file of vernacular papers bearing on the subject is herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient
servant

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To.

1908.

From
B. Krishna Rao Esqr
Sub Division officer
French Rocks

To
M. Kanakaraj Aro Esqr B.A.
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Dated 23 June 1908

Despatched

Received

General No. 1088
No.

Enclosure No. 1 Statement file sent separately.

Sir,

With reference to your docket no 99 dated 21st August 1907 re the Inam lands endowed to the Sri Kasi Viswes wara temple at Ganjam, I have the honor to submit the entire records on the subject together with the Amildar's detailed report no 900 dated 12th instant and to state in order as follows regarding the several points referred to in the Durgai Secretary's letter no: 80 dated 10.7.

1. As there was no means for the recovery of the produce for 1896-97 from Venkata Giri Goosayi, the hereditary

belonging to his surety (Jogendra Giri Goodaji) at French Rocks was sold for Rs 255/- and confirmed by the Deputy Commissioner (Vide Gadi No 300 dated 26.8.04).

II For the recovery of the Gutta for 1897-98, 98-99 the property of Bette Gowda and Hanume Gowda were sold by which Rs 430/- were realized and were deposited in the Savings Bank. The balance could not be recovered as there was no means for the same. The full value of the produce for the year 1899-00 viz Rs 933-15-6 has been recovered and credited to the Savings Bank Deposit.

III As far as possible prompt steps are reported to have been taken in the matter by all officers. The interference of the civil Court against the cultivators and want of Government support to the latter appears to be some of the causes of delays and inconvenience.

Jogendra Goodaji's house at French Rocks was sold for Rs 255/- as stated in para I above. The sale of the property of Bette

Bette Gowda and Hamme Gowda was confirmed and the sale proceeds were credited to the Savings Bank deposit. The balance due by these individuals was not recovered as there was no means for the same.

vi The value of the produce for 1901-02 has also been recovered and credited to the Savings Bank deposit.

VII The balance of gutta amount for 1899-00 and 1900-01 has not been recovered.

VIII In 1902-03 the lands were under cultivation and the value of the gutta produce viz Rs 661-8-0 has been credited to the Savings Bank deposit. In 1903-04 the lands were not cultivated as already reported and recorded in Govt order No. 2189 dated 29.1.04 Rev 37 3396

A statement shewing the particulars of demand, collection and Balance of gutta amount by each lessee is attached.

The lands are reported to have been leased out to one

Bommu

Bomme Gowda of Kirangur
for 5 years at 115 kandies
a year from 1905-06. The
amount in deposit at the
credit of the temple at the
end of May 1908 is said to
be Rs 6778-2-5 in the Savings
Bank and Rs 488-5-6 in the
Revenue deposit, in all Rs 7266-7-11
The particulars of the recover-
-ies from 1904-05 to 1907-08 had
not been shewn. As the records
were called for urgently and
could not be delayed, a clerk
was sent from this office
and on the information gathered
by him as far as possible, a
correct demand collection and
Balance statement of the lease
amount is prepared and here-
with submitted.

It would not be advantageous
to lease out the lands for a
longer period than 5 years.
It may even be more advan-
tageously leased out every
year by public auction
at the proper season should

there

there be proper competition.

I have &c

(Sd) B. Krishna Rao
Sub Division officer
French Rocks.

"Copy"

B. Krishna Rao
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Sl. 10

G.R.S. 31]

No. 276
Muz 33 of 1905.

From

The Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Genl. and Rev. Dept.

(Muzrai).

To

The Deputy Commissioner,

Mysore District.

, the 19th November 190

Genl. and Rev.
Secretariat

Sir

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. 24, dated 12th July 1902 about the Kasi Vis-weswara Temple in Cosayi Ghat, I am directed to state that when the case was heard today it was argued that as the Inam lands are under Government resumption, Venkatachalapathi Cosayi is responsible for paying the Government dues and maintaining the Temple from them, and that therefore the money spent by the Government should be made good out of the money now in the hands of Government. As this prayer is fair and has been accordingly ordered in the final order (vide Government order No. 5004-5, dated 20th June 1902 in the matter of the Presence Manjunatheswara Temple) the Government relation is to a detailed scheme and to the proposal Venkatachalapathi Cosayi is to be carried out.

2. It is not clear what amount should be considered to be incurred on behalf of Government for the purpose of Government dues and maintenance of the Temple. In the absence of

GPB - 4000—13-5 08

[illegible] statement received with the letter [illegible].

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Fair Sht)

For Secretary to Government.

Sl 11

శ్రీ కాంతం శ్రీనివాసు వారసులు కూచర్లపాడు

పోలంరాజు రామ చంద్రాపురపుళ్ళు

శ్రీ రంగం కట్టడకాల్లోను గుంటూరు దగ్గర క్రైస్తవాంచలోను ప్రసిద్ధులు. ఇంగ్లీషు విద్యాభ్యాసంలో - వారి కుటుంబీకుల్లో ఎక్కువ కాలం నివసించిన వారు అబ్రహాం లింకన్ యొక్క - స్నేహితులు —

—

వీళ్ళలో ఒక్కరు నివసించిన వారి యొక్క వివరాలు క్రింద ఇవ్వబడినవి:—

అబ్రహాం లింకన్ యొక్క వివరాలు గుంటూరు కాలేజి లోదగ్గర్లో దేవాలయం కట్టించి- చుంచాయ రెడ్డి ప్రతిష్ఠించిన తరువాత ఈ దేవాలయంలో నిరంతరంగా- దేవరుగళ్ళకి చూచి-స్నేహిస్తూ- దీపారాధనకి వెళ్ళిన చేతియు నరియువరకిచ్చిన పత్రం 1820 నిత్యకృత్యంగా ప్రతిష్ఠాపనా మహోత్సవంలో శ్రీమద్వేదాంతాచార్యులు క్రైస్తవాంధ్రవర్తియర్చకుడుగా రన్నచ్చిన్నిర్ణయించడం- మహా భాగ్యులయిన వీళ్ళలో దేవరుగళ్ళ చిన్నకి వంద రూపాయ్లనాగా కొంతలవ కొనకొలు కాలు విగ్రహప్రతిష్ఠ యున్న శరవణ తిరిగొస్తుంది- 1000 వందు నూరు వరకు లిఖాయి శరకొన్న దగ్గర గళ్ళన్న. ఇనాముగా దయ చాలితిరు— ఈ భక్తిశ్రద్ధలతో అనుకూలంగా నోచి యి యువరు వీళ్ళంతర దేవరుగళ్ళ దినచర్యలు వెళ్ళి విశేష దివ్యదర్శ చేసిన్నట్లు చూసి వెలుతురు ధరించిన వాళ్ళకరవర చూసిన్నట్లు- బ్రాహ్మణ్యంవారా ధ్యానంలోను ఇదరిలో ఉన్నవాళ్ళ కియ్య చట్టివారి విశ్వాసంచుకర్ణన్న నిళ్ళేర్చిన రి. అదరంచి అవరు. అనంతర అవరశేలాగ్నిహోత్రంచేసి యాగం చేసిన్నట్లు శాదరు—

వీళ్ళంతర దేవస్థానకట్టడిగి. భూమాయి 60 ఎకరాల్నగ్గా కాపు- అవన్నీ- యువరుంచు రిజిస్టరాన్నో- మూడు దేవర్చనం లక్ష్మీ కిచ్చిన్నట్లు వరకొన్నీ- కాంగ్రాం వాయిదాలు లెక్కించి 1875 నెలవరి మూలధనాన్నిచ్చి లక్ష్మీనారాయణ సోమయాజులు చాలమంది దేవస్థానవన్న బాగుచేసి వేసిరు- అన్నిటిలో క్లోమ క్రాస్తవాయిదాలు- దేవరుగళ్ళ చేసిన్నట్లు వీళ్ళకిచ్చి చాలమంది రు— ఈచాలకి తిరిగిరాగళ్ళో జనగణాచారిగా 6-6-1878 లో వంద ఇనాము పొందిన తర్వాత లిఖిత్తుల్ని శాశ్వతంగా ట్రస్టీలు— ఈ మొత్తాన్నాళ్ళు మళ్ళ జనగణాచారి

[illegible]

[illegible] 1878 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 15 [illegible]

[illegible] 1878 [illegible]

1879 [illegible] 23-7-1880 [illegible] 2750 [illegible]

[illegible] 1881 [illegible] 1882 [illegible] 1 [illegible]

ఇట్లాం జమాందారు మళ్ళ శ్రీనివాస రాజు శ్రీమతి మళ్ళు అమ్మ సాక్షిగా కొండపల్లిలు
నన్న స్వాధీపత్రములు వ్రాయించుకొన్నవారు వీరు సాక్షులు

రాజులు శ్రీమతి మళ్ళు అమ్మగారిలు మృతిచెందిన తర్వాత వీరి కుమారులు రాజా వెంకట
రంగారావు బహద్దరు వారికి 1888 సంవత్సరం ఆగష్టు 4 వ తేదీన నన్న కలుగుట చేత
వీళ్ళందరు రాజ్యమునకు వచ్చినచో ఇట్టి ఇబ్బందులు కష్టనష్టములు కలుగకుండా
నన్న పట్టాలు రాజా వారికి ఇవ్వబడినవి. ఆ పట్టాలు వీరు తీసుకొని వెళ్ళిపోయిరి
అప్పటికి వీరి వయస్సు 18 సంవత్సరములు మాత్రమే. అందువలన వీరి తల్లిగారు
మళ్ళు అమ్మగారు 1888 సంవత్సరం ఆగష్టు 28 వ తేదీన ఆజ్ఞాపత్రము వ్రాసి
ఇవ్వడమును, వీరి తండ్రిగారు రాజా వెంకట రంగారావు బహద్దరు వారు
కొన్ని సంవత్సరములు రాజ్యపరిపాలన చేసిన తర్వాత 1893 లో అకస్మాత్తుగా
మరణించిరి. అందువలన 1893 లో అప్పటి రాజా వారి ధర్మపత్నిగారు
శ్రీమతి నాగమ్మ అమ్మగారు రాజ్యపరిపాలన చేయుచుండిరి. వీరి కాలమున
వీరి కుమారులు రాజా వెంకట రంగారావు బహద్దరు వారు 1889 లో
మేజర్ అయిన తర్వాత వీరి తల్లిగారు శ్రీమతి నాగమ్మ అమ్మగారు
రాజ్యమును వీరి కుమారులకు అప్పగించిరి. అప్పటి నుండి రాజా వెంకట
రంగారావు బహద్దరు వారు రాజ్యపరిపాలన చేయుచుండిరి. వీరి కాలమున
రాజ్యమునకు ఆదాయము 6000 రూపాయలు మాత్రమే వచ్చుచుండెను.

ఆ తర్వాత వీరు మళ్ళీ మళ్ళీ అప్పులు చేయుచు వచ్చిరి. అప్పులు ఎక్కువ
అయిపోయినవి. కోర్టు వారు వీరి ఆస్తులను అమ్మివేయుటకు ఆదేశించిరి.
1-2-1894 న కోర్టు వారు ఆస్తులను అమ్మివేయుటకు ఆదేశించిరి. 17-11-1901 న
వీరు మరణించిరి. వీరి మరణానంతరం వీరి కుమారులు రాజా వెంకట
రంగారావు బహద్దరు వారు రాజ్యపరిపాలన చేయుచుండిరి. వీరి కాలమున
కోర్టు వారు ఆస్తులను అమ్మివేయుటకు ఆదేశించిరి.

ఈ విధంగా కోర్టు వారు ఆస్తులను అమ్మివేయుటకు ఆదేశించిరి. వీరి ఆస్తులను
వేలంవేయగా వచ్చిన ధనము సరిపోలేదు. అందువలన మిగిలిన అప్పులు
తీర్చుటకై వీరి ఆస్తులను అమ్మివేయుటకు ఆదేశించిరి. అందువలన 4325
ఎకరాలు భూమిని అమ్మివేసిరి. వీరి ఆస్తులను అమ్మివేయుటకు ఆదేశించిరి
దివాలాదారు ఆస్తులను అమ్మివేయుటకు ఆదేశించిరి. వీరి ఆస్తులను అమ్మివేయుటకు
దేవాలయ 4349-4-9 ఎకరాలు భూమిని అమ్మివేసిరి. వీరి ఆస్తులను
దివాలాదారు ఆస్తులను అమ్మివేయుటకు ఆదేశించిరి. 15-6-1897 న
వీరి ఆస్తులను అమ్మివేయుటకు ఆదేశించిరి.

1893 లో అప్పటి రాజా వారి ధర్మపత్నిగారు శ్రీమతి నాగమ్మ అమ్మగారు
మరణించిరి. వీరి మరణానంతరం వీరి కుమారులు రాజా వెంకట రంగారావు
బహద్దరు వారు రాజ్యపరిపాలన చేయుచుండిరి. వీరి కాలమున 93-94-95-96
ఈ 4 సంవత్సరములలో భయంకరమైన కరువు వచ్చినది. ఈ కరువు వలన
92 మంది మరణించిరి. 5 సంవత్సరములలో మొత్తం 97 మంది మరణించిరి.

[illegible]
1897 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1897 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 97 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 97 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 4 [illegible]
2 [illegible] 6 [illegible]
[illegible] 72 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
23-7-1880 [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

		రూపాయలు	
(1) 123-7-80 కోనుగోళ్లు			
రాజమండ్రి వర్తక సంఘం	అసలు 2750-0-0	※1575-0-0	
	వడ్డీలు 489-0-0		
	చిల్లర 114-0-0		
	తిరిగి కొనుగోలు చేసినది		3341-14-0
		3353-0-0	4916-14-0
	చిల్లర తగ్గింపు	787-2-7	
		2565-13-5	
		7482-11-5	
(2) ఆ వస్తువులలో కొన్ని చిల్లర వర్తకులకు అమ్మినది		అసలు 2585-0-2	※1764-4-7
	చిల్లర	356-0-0	
		110-12-0	
	తిరిగి కొనుగోలు చేసినది	-	3274-4-0
		3051-12-2	5038-8-7
	చిల్లర తగ్గింపు	952-8-0	
		2099-4-2	
		7137-12-9	

※ 1575-0-0 కాకుండా 1764-4-7 తీసుకోవడమైనది

(3) ఈ సంవత్సరములో ఇతరులు తిరిగి కొనుగోలు చేసినది
లాభంలో కొంత భాగం తిరిగి కొనే నిబంధన
మీద అమ్మిన వస్తువుల విలువ
వసూలు కావలసిన రద్దు అయిన అసలు 5000-0-0

(4) 1897 సంవత్సరం ఆదాయము
తీసివేయగా - 12 నెలలకు -
నెలకు 260 రూపాయలు
చొప్పున - - - 3120-0-0

(5) 1896-7; 1897-8; 1898-9,
1899-00; 00-1; మరియు
5 సంవత్సరములకు సంబంధించినది
29-0-9 నాటి లెక్కలోనిది
సరిగ్గా వసూలుకానిది - 150-0-0

	12935-1-7	9955-6-7
	22890-8-2	

ఈ చిల్లర వర్తకుల దగ్గర వర్తకం - చివరకుగాను మిగిలిన 12935-1-7 రూపాయల విలువ గల వస్తువులు 30 నెలల లోపలనే వాడుకలోకి వస్తాయి కనుక వీటిని వాడుకలోకి వచ్చిన వెంటనే 4 సంవత్సరములలో వ్రాసివేయవలెను. ఇట్లు చేసినచో ఈ సంవత్సరపు లాభము నుండి 9955-6-7 రూపాయలు - చివరకు 22890-8-2 రూపాయలు -

Sworn to before me by Venkatapuram

Additional Munsiff

D502

Sl 12

Exhibit A
Report submitted with petition
Dt 31/12/08

[illegible]

(1) 9-10-1878 [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
(2) 12-7-80	400 [illegible]	[illegible]
(3) 12-7-80	870 - [illegible]	[illegible]
(4) 12-7-80	180 [illegible]	[illegible]
(5) 23-7-80	2750 [illegible]	[illegible]
(6) 31-12-80 [illegible] 20-9-92 [illegible]	[illegible] 3.	
7 9-1-82	[illegible]	[illegible]
(8) 20-1-82	[illegible]	[illegible]
9) 20-1-82	[illegible]	[illegible]
10 10-3-83	[illegible]	[illegible]
(11) 4-2-96	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible] 13 [illegible]

S Manjanna
Adv for appellants

26-12-08

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 7-7-1911. ~~[illegible]~~
[illegible]

Returned before me
[illegible]
7/1/174

G.R.S. 29A]

190 . Sl 13

From

Secy. to the Govt. of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To

The Dy Commr
Mysore Dist

Dated

Despatched 10.3.1909

Received

General No. 1276

Mucy F No. 14-08 14

Enclosure No.

In continuation of this office no 276 dated 19th November 1908 calling for a report on the claim of Venkatagiri Gosai for the amount due to him from the Kasi Visweswaraswamy temple in Gosai Ghat, Ganjam, Seerangapatam Taluk, and the subsequent marginal

No 855 Dj 25-2-09
24-1081 Dj 15-2-09

Noted reminders, has the honour to forward herewith petition regd no D 502 (with its enclosures) from Venkatagiri Gosai and his agent - furnishing accounts etc. regarding the amounts due to him and to request that the submission of the report may kindly be expedited.

By order,
Sd/-
4/3/1909
for Secretary.
4/3/09

D 668 SL.14

~~1909~~ - 1910.

From H. Chandy Esq B.A.
Offg: Deputy Commr
Mysore District

To
K.S. Chandrasekhara Iyer Esq B.A.L.
Secy: to Govt Revenue Branch

Dated 24.9.09

Despatched 26

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No. 16 in 12 of Regd Post

Submits further report re Swami lands endowed to the Kasi Visweswara Swami temple at Ganjam.

Refer

AG

27/9/09

AG

No. 137
Enc. No. 1 file
By Regd Post

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commr
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore Camp 24/26 th Septr 1909.

To
K. S. Chendrasekhara Iyer
.....Esq., B.A. B.L.
SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.
Inamsai Branch.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter no 276 Inam 33-1896 dated 19th November 1908 calling for further report regarding the Inam lands endowed to the Sri Kasi Visweswara Swami temple at Ganjam in the Seringapatam Taluk, I have the honor to state that from the Sub Divisional officer's letter no 1198 dated 20/22.6.09 and the file of correspondence ending with his memo no 186 dated the 10/11th September 1909 herewith submitted in original, the following facts appear:—

1. That the Inam lands attached

to the temple were taken under Government management in 1895-96 and the local cess of 12½ on the said lands were paid by Venkatagiri Gosayi and his Agents till the year 1900-1901; that from 1901-02 to 1907-1908 the local cess was deducted from the produce of the Inam lands and a bill was submitted for sanction from temple funds of the cess due for 1908-1909; that from the time of the resumption of the Inam lands by Government the cost of maintaining the temple was not borne by Government; that neither Venkatagiri Gosayi nor his agent has produced the list of expenditure incurred towards the maintenance of the temple and that no other references are forthcoming in the Taluk records.

Fasli					
1895-96	మున్నధ్	29	3	2	
1896-97	మువుజిబ	30	4	9	
1897-98	జిఁఇళ్ళంతి	29	4	9	
1898-99	ఇళ్ళంతి	23	12	9	
1899-1900	ఇస్తాది	23	12	9	
1900-1901	ఖాస్తది	24	6	9	
		1 0	12	11	

2. The details of expenditure

Revenue

shewn in the statement for-
warded with this office letter
No. 24 dated 12th July 1908 are
explained in the Amildar's
report No. 13 dated 23.7.1909.

The enclosures received with
the marginally noted refer-
ences are herewith retrans-
mitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant

K Mandy
Dy Deputy Commissioner
Mysore district

B.a.

19 date
10.3.09
21.4.09
27.4.09

No.
1275
dated 14-06
1662
14-06
1763
dated

ಸಿ.16

ನಂ. 1520

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಸಿಸಿಎ 2ಸಿಸಿಎಸ್ 2025

ಕಛೇರಿ ಜ್ಞಾಪನ

ವಿಷಯ: ಸಿಸಿಎಸ್ (ಸಿಸಿಎ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು, 1965 ರ ನಿಯಮ 16 ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮಾನತು ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲು ಸಲಹಾ ಮಂಡಳಿಯ ರಚನೆ.

ಸಿಸಿಎಸ್ (ಸಿಸಿಎ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು, 1965 ರ ನಿಯಮ 26 ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮಾನತು ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲು ಸಲಹಾ ಮಂಡಳಿಯನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಲಹಾ ಮಂಡಳಿಯ ಸಂಯೋಜನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅಮಾನತು ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲು ಸಲಹಾ ಮಂಡಳಿಯ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖದ ನಿಯಮಗಳನ್ನು ಕೆಳಗೆ ನೀಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 25-1-1910 ಕಛೇರಿ ಮೇಲ್ವಿಚಾರಕರು

Recd by post
27/1/10

ವಿ 15 ಎ Sch 17

ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಸಮಾಚಾರ

೧೯೧೯ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ೧೫ ರಿಂದ ೨೫ ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನವರೆಗೆ ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಪ್ರವಾಸವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆವು. ಈ ಪ್ರವಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಆಡಳಿತ ಮತ್ತು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಮಗ್ರವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ನಡೆಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಒಟ್ಟು ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ೧೮೭೧ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯ ಜನಗಣತಿಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ೨೭೫೦೦೦ ಆಗಿದ್ದು, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು ಶೇಕಡಾ ೬೫ ರಷ್ಟು ಜನರು ಕೃಷಿಯನ್ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಉದ್ಯೋಗವಾಗಿ ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಭತ್ತ, ಅಡಿಕೆ, ಕಾಳುಮೆಣಸು ಮತ್ತು ಕಬ್ಬು ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ಬೆಳೆಗಳು.

ಪ್ರವಾಸದ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಗರ, ಶಿಕಾರಿಪುರ, ಹೊಸನಗರ ಮತ್ತು ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳ ಕಚೇರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಕಂದಾಯ ವಸೂಲಾತಿ, ಭೂ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳ ನಿರ್ವಹಣೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕೆರೆ ನೀರಾವರಿ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆರೆಗಳ ಏರಿಗಳು ಶಿಥಿಲಗೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿದ್ದು, ಅವುಗಳ ದುರಸ್ತಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಷಣ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶಿಕ್ಷಣದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ೨೧೪ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಿದ್ದು, ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ೧೭೨ ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಾಲೆಗಳು, ೩೦ ಮಾಧ್ಯಮಿಕ ಶಾಲೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ೧೨ ಉನ್ನತ ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಾಲೆಗಳು ಸೇರಿವೆ. ಒಟ್ಟು ೯೪೫೦ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಶಾಲೆಗಳಿಗೆ ದಾಖಲಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೆಣ್ಣುಮಕ್ಕಳ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ನೀಡಲು ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಶಾಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಅನೇಕ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಮರದ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕುಳಿತು ಪಾಠ ಕೇಳುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇದೆ.

ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಸೇವೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದಾಗ, ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ, ಮೂರು ಸಮುದಾಯ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಕೇಂದ್ರಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಹನ್ನೆರಡು ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಕೇಂದ್ರಗಳಿವೆ. ಮಲೇರಿಯಾ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾಲರಾ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳು ಕಳೆದ ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗಿವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಶುದ್ಧ ಕುಡಿಯುವ ನೀರಿನ ಕೊರತೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಗಂಭೀರವಾಗಿದೆ. ಬಾವಿಗಳ ನೀರು ಕಲುಷಿತವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅತಿಸಾರ ಭೇದಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳು ಮಳೆಗಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತವೆ.

ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲು ಕಚ್ಚಾ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳಿವೆ. ಮಳೆಗಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳು ಸಂಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಗರ ನಡುವೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸುಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ರಸ್ತೆ ಇದೆ. ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ೩೨ ಎತ್ತಿನ ಗಾಡಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ೫ ಮೋಟಾರು ವಾಹನಗಳು ನೋಂದಣಿಯಾಗಿವೆ. ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಗೆ ಹೊಸ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ, ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಕಂದಾಯ ವಸೂಲಾತಿ ಸಮಾಧಾನಕರವಾಗಿದೆ. ೧೯೧೮-೧೯ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ೧೪೨೦೦೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕಂದಾಯ ವಸೂಲಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಇದು ಗುರಿಯ ಶೇಕಡಾ ೯೫ ರಷ್ಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಬಾಕಿ ಉಳಿದಿರುವ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯು ಸಾಧಾರಣ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು, ಕೆಲವು ಸುಧಾರಣೆಗಳ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿದೆ.

[illegible]

7 1892 [illegible] 2750 [illegible] 1880 [illegible] 92 [illegible]

8 15 [illegible] 1893 [illegible] 1893·4·5 [illegible]

9 1897 [illegible]

10 1909 [illegible] 17 [illegible]

27—1—1910.

[illegible]

Sl. 18

File No. 14-M

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

, *the* 190

ate of issue

Signed by

READ—

G O no 920-1 dated
Mng 2 30.96
8th February 1897 directing the assumption of the entire management of the Temple of Sri Kasi Visweswara Swamy and of its endowments in the Srirangapatam Taluk

ORDER THEREON.—NO.

Letter no 90 dated 5th September 1906 from the Dy. Commr, Mysore dist.— submitting for orders petition of Venkadagiri Gosai praying that he may be put in possession of the Inam la over

SUBJECT

GPB—10,000—10-4-06

of the above temple ~~& till~~ the amount due to him from Bhavanaji Bhaskarbi is recouped.

Petition recd. no D. 502 dated 31st Decr 1908 from Venkatagiri Gosai specifying in detail the nature of his claim and producing the documents upon which it is based.

Letter no 139 dated 24th Septr 1909 from the Dy. Commr, Mysore Distt, reporting on the above.

Order thereon - no 1196-7 Dt 10-11-1910.
Mins 4 14-06

The temple of Sri Kasivisweswara at Gosaigi Ghat in Ganjam in the Srirangapatam Taluk is a Muz- insti endowed with Inam lands measuring 24 acres 34 guntas and assessed at Rs 193/ in Kirangur village. The affairs of the insti were being

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation Sheet draft form.)

managed by a line of Gosayi ascetics, the last of whom one Bhanaraj Bharat borrowed money from Peter Venkadagiri Gosai and appointed him as his Agent for the management of the temple and its endowments.

2. The Dy Commr having reported to Govt that the affairs of the temple were in a very ~~the most~~ unsatisfactory state, Govt in their order read above, directed the assumption of the management of the temple and its Inam lands, and the Dy Commr was requested to take charge of the lands forthwith and to place them under the management of the Taluk Amildar: Venkatagiri Gosai's petition for revision of this order was rejected on 21st August 1897.

3. On receipt of this Govt order the Amildar of the Srirangapatam Dy. assumed the management of the lands in April 1897, and obtained a Kudchalika from Venkadagiri Gosai

in which he agreed to make over the produce of the Inam Lands for 1896-7.

No steps were taken to assume the management of the temple which even now continues with the pet". Venkadagiri Gosain

4 Venkadagiri Gosai now requests that either he may be put in possession of the Inam lands of the temple till the recompense of the debt money due to him from Dhanaraya Bharathi or that he may be paid a sum of Rs 22890-8-2 in full satisfaction of his claims

5. Venkadagiri Gosai's request to be put in possession of the Lands cannot be entertained.

6 His claim for Rs 22890-8-2 is made up of the following five items:—

1. Rs 7482-11-5 under a decree obtained against Dhanaraya Bharathi in Suit no 15 of 1892 in the Sub judge's court at Mysore.
2. Rs 7137-12-9, under a decree obtained against the said Dhanaraya Bharathi in Suit no 61 of 1892 in the same court.

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

3 ~~Rs~~ 5000/- — amount paid to one Ramaswamiengar (who was for some time lessee of the lands under Dharmasay Bharati) under chief court's Decree

4 ~~Rs~~ 3120/- — cost of maintaining the temple for 12 years from 1897 at ~~Rs~~ 260/- a year

5. ~~Rs~~ 150/- — Govt dues paid for 5 years from 1896-7 to 1900-1

~~Rs~~ Total. Rs 22890-8-2

6 The first three items refer to transactions with which Govt had nothing to do and to a period during which no part of the proceeds of the property came into the hands of Govt. The petr can have neither a legal nor a moral claim against Govt for reimbursement

7. Items 4 and 5 relate to expenses actually incurred during the period when Govt got the proceeds of the Enam lands ~~[illegible]~~ Rs — thereupon, per. The Rep. Commissioner

1GCPB—30,000—5-1-05

records it is found that
the rent due to Govt
from the lessees for 3 years
has not been recovered,
chiefly on account of the
attachment of the crops
by the petr, Govt ~~are~~ ~~has~~
cannot pay the charges for
maintaining the temple in
these years. At the same
time they do not hold the
petr liable for the rent
thus unrecovered.

¶ 8. As regards the amount
due for annual maintenance,
Govt observe that ~~the~~ petr
while
now claims ~~Rs~~ 260/ a year,
& ~~though~~ and has furnished details for
~~Rs~~ 291-10-8 he in 1896 admitted
before the ~~Sub Divl officer~~ Asst Commr French Rocks had given
that the annual expr was
~~Rs~~ 200/ more or less and
marked a scale of expr
not exceeding ~~Rs~~ 250/ to be
fixed. In these circs. Govt
can only sanction ~~Rs~~ 200
for annual maintenance

¶ 9. Against the sum of
~~Rs~~ 1950 thus due to petr,
a sum of ~~Rs~~ 655/ still due by
him under the Muthalika

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

towards the rent of 1896-7 has to be set off. Govt on the whole are therefore pleased to sanction ~~a sum~~ the payt of a sum of ~~Rs~~ 1295- to Petr ~~the Dy Commr~~ out of the sum at the credit of the instn the Dy Commr, Mysore Dist, is requested to submit a bill for the amount.

10 M. Govt note in the disappointment that the order of 1897 has not yet been ~~fully~~ given effect to inasmuch as the management of the temple has not yet been assumed by ~~Govt~~ the Dy. Commr. He is requested to assume the management at once and submit at an early date the a suitable scale of expr for the sanction of Govt. There can be no objection to enlist if necessary the help of Venkatagiri Gosai after taking proper precautions to prevent his mis-using the income to recoup himself for his real or fancied past losses

6

87

10/3/1910

D(A)

For Secretary

Sir,

Mr. Dy Commr, Mysore Dist
& Comptr, Mysore Govt
have left Bangalore.

Yours

No 1368 dt 22-11-1910.
Mun. T. 14-06

మేజిస్ట్రేటు వారి కోర్టులు

సరళీకరించుట విషయమై చేసిన

కార్యనిర్వాహక ఉత్తర్వులు.

ఈ క్రింద చదువబడిన కాగితాలు

చదువబడినవి కాబట్టి కాగితాలలో

ఇందు రాయబడిన విషయములను

గురించి ఈ క్రింది ఉత్తర్వులు

ఇవ్వబడినవి

మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రంలో ప్రస్తుతం

ఉన్న మేజిస్ట్రేటు కోర్టులు

ఎక్కువ ఖర్చుతో కూడినవిగా

ఉన్నాయని, ప్రజలకు

అసౌకర్యంగా ఉన్నాయని

ఫిర్యాదులు వచ్చినందున

ఈ విషయమై 1907 వ సంవత్సరపు

మద్రాసు మేజిస్ట్రేట్ల చట్టం

D. 502 వ పుటలో ఉన్న

ఈ క్రింది నిబంధనలు

ಮೈಸೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಹುಣಸೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಕಸಬಾ ಹೋಬಳಿಯ ಕಾಡಂಚಿನ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳೆದ ಕೆಲವು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಕಾಡಾನೆಗಳ ಹಾವಳಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಬೆಳೆ ನಷ್ಟದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಸುಮಾರು 1290 ರಷ್ಟಿದೆ. ಈ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುತೇಕ ರೈತರು ಒಂದೇ ಮಾದರಿಯ ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ಅವುಗಳ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗಾಗಿ ಸಮಿತಿಯೊಂದನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿ ಉಪವಿಭಾಗಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಲತಾ ಕುಲಕರ್ಣಿ ಅವರು ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಲಿದ್ದು, ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿ ಅರಣ್ಯ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಅರಣ್ಯ ಸಂರಕ್ಷಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಂಜುನಾಥ ಕೆ. ಹೆಗಡೆ, ಕೃಷಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು ಹಾಗೂ ಇಬ್ಬರು ರೈತ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳು ಇರಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಮಿತಿಯು ಪ್ರತಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳಕ್ಕೆ ಭೇಟಿ ನೀಡಿ, ಬೆಳೆ ನಷ್ಟದ ಪ್ರಮಾಣವನ್ನು ಅಂದಾಜಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ತಿಂಗಳೊಳಗೆ ವರದಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.